

①

LOWRY LANDFILL Superfund Site

Five-Year Review Interview Form

Site Name: LOWRY LANDFILL

EPA ID No.: COD980499248

Interviewer Name: Katherine Jenkins

Affiliation: EPA

Subject Name: BONNIE RADER

Affiliation: CITIZENS FOR LOWRY

Time:

Date: LANDFILL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NOW

- 1) Are you aware of the former environmental issues at the Site and the cleanup activities that have taken place to date?

Yes, we are aware. There have been no cleanup activities in the deep pits to date. The 138 million gallons of chemical waste remain buried under a 100' lift of clay and trash, making it more difficult to reach the pits to remediate.

- 2) What is your overall impression of the project, including cleanup, maintenance and reuse activities (as appropriate)?

Included is a copy of CLLEAN's comments during the 2012 5 Year Review. Not one of CLLEAN's concerns in the 2012 5 Year Review have been addressed. The project is not being cleaned up, the Record of Decision for the Lowry Site requires Containment. The Site cannot be reused. The chemicals are at least 2.5 miles off-site and probably more. Which proves that the Site is not In Compliance - containment has not been achieved. Operable Units 1 and 6 (shallow groundwater) have not performed as required. The LLSF Site is not meeting the ARARs. EPA is not enforcing the ROD at the LLSF Site.

- 3) What have been the effects of this Site on the surrounding community, if any?

Before the pits were covered, the chemicals traveled in the air for at least 8 miles. Many people had problems with nose bleeds, headaches, tingling hands and feet, heart issues and Bronchial Pneumonia with no fever. Once the pits were covered, those symptoms went away. At that time, residents knew when they were being impacted by chemicals from the pits at Lowry because of the odors and the oily film that covered their skin.

Now, the threat is more insidious, because the residents cannot smell or feel the chemicals from the pits. The chemical contamination that remains in the Lowry Landfill Superfund Site threatens to pollute the underground aquifers that serve the entire Front Range of Colorado, and our private domestic wells. Within a five-mile radius of the Site, there are four developments, all of which rely on groundwater for their domestic use. People are no longer worried about health impacts from the air, they are worried that the water they use will make them sick, and they won't know why until it is too late. Many are worried about how having chemicals in the groundwater under their homes will affect their property values. When the City of Denver and Waste Management say they have no intention of cleaning up the off-site plume, and EPA Region 8 concurred, this causes even more anxiety.

- 4) Have there been any problems with unusual or unexpected activities at the Site, such as emergency response, vandalism or trespassing?

Yes. The Contractor for the City of Denver and Waste Management has been manipulating the data from the LLSF Site to make it look like the Site is In Compliance. EPA, has not scientifically reviewed the data produced by the Contractor, or taken split samples to validate that the data from sampling by the Contractor is accurate, has been approving the Contractor's conclusions that the LLSF Site is In Compliance, when in reality, it is not In Compliance. In the meantime, the contamination from the LLSF Site has traveled north in the groundwater and onto private property.

5) Has EPA kept involved parties and surrounding neighbors informed of activities at the Site?

No. The last public meeting EPA held in the neighborhoods where the 1,4-dioxane plume has traveled was in 2006. It was a public meeting at which EPA announced the existence of an off-site plume and stated that the off-site plume posed no danger to the public because everyone uses City of Aurora Water. EPA refused to discuss that there are residents in the area who have private domestic wells, and do not use City of Aurora Water. At the meeting, EPA RPM Bonita Lavelle told the residents that EPA would keep them up-dated on a regular basis. The next update from EPA was 7 years later, 2013, when the EPA released a new Fact Sheet. The new Fact Sheet had a number of statements that CLLEAN did not want included because they were misleading to a public who was not directly involved in the Site. EPA released the Fact Sheet to the public with the misleading information.

The City of Denver, Waste Management and their PR Firm, Intermountain Public Affairs, began a concerted effort to prevent CLLEAN from participating in the process. The EPA Public Involvement Coordinator did not object on behalf of CLLEAN, even though CLLEAN is a TAG recipient and it is EPA's mandate, under SARA, to include impacted stakeholders in the entire process.

a) Do you feel well-informed regarding the Site's activities and remedial progress?

Yes, by our own persistence, we are well informed.

As no-one is remediating at the Site, there is no remedial progress.

If anything, the Site is in worse condition because the EPA has not acted as a Lead Agency and EPA has blindly accepted the City of Denver and Waste Management's manipulated data, which says the Site is In Compliance. CLLEAN data proves that the Site is not In Compliance and EPA Washington, D.C. Headquarters Scientists agree with CLLEAN.

b) How can EPA best provide site-related information in the future?

By providing regular updates to CLLEAN who will use their current outreach email and flyer distribution list to reach the community.